



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|-------------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/506,368 | 01/21/2005 | Frederick Mark Manassch | 0004800USU/2279 | 1079 |
| 27623 7590 12/09/2008 OHLANDT, GREELEY, RUGGIERO & PERLE, LLP ONE LANDMARK SQUARE, 10TH FLOOR STAMFORD, CT 06901 | | | | |
| EXAMINER | | | | |
| WANG, KENT F | | | | |
| ART UNIT | | PAPER NUMBER | | |
| 2622 | | | | |
| MAIL DATE | | DELIVERY MODE | | |
| 12/09/2008 | | PAPER | | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Interview Summary

Application No.

10/506,368

Applicant(s)

MANASSEH ET AL.

Examiner

KENT WANG

Art Unit

2622

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) KENT WANG.(3) Scott Miloro and Pamela Wingood.(2) Tuan Ho.(4) Tali Gat-Falik.

Date of Interview: 05 December 2008.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal (copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: Brunetti, Houvener, and Colmenarez.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Ms. Tali Gat-Falik explained several key features which are related to the technical concept of the invention. Ms. Wingood explained the differential features between the invention and the prior arts. Regarding claim 1, it was agreed that the proposed amendment overcome the rejection. However, the propose amendment is considered raising new issue and will not be entered and further consideration will be required.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Tuan V Ho/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2622